



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/827,855	04/06/2001	Krister Draxo	7112	8864

7590 12/02/2004  
JOHNS MANVILLE INTERNATIONAL, INC.  
Legal Department  
P.O. Box 5108  
Denver, CO 80217

EXAMINER

BOYD, JENNIFER A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1771

DATE MAILED: 12/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/827,855

Applicant(s)

DRAXO ET AL.

Examiner

Jennifer A Boyd

Art Unit

1771

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 12 November 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: it does not overcome the previously set forth rejections. 6. In response to Applicant's argument that Tucci is nonanalogous art, the Examiner respectfully argues the contrary. Tucci discloses that the composition can be used in wall and floor coverings (column 10, lines 55 - 60). Even though Tucci does not directly disclose the actual wall covering substrate, Tucci does suggest the use of the composition in a wall covering and that the composition can be applied to an array of fabric substrates including textile blends, woven, non-woven, knits, etc (column 10, lines 44 - 55). In response to Applicant's argument that the language "consisting essentially of " would exclude pressure sensitive adhesive, the Examiner respectfully argues the contrary. The present invention and the invention of Fagan is directed to adherable and removable wallpaper. Fagan states in the Abstract that the sheet material suitable for wallpaper "can be firmly adhered to a surface, and yet readily removed therefrom, without the necessity of pre-wetting and without damaging the surface". Furthermore, Fagan states "the adherable, yet removable nature of the sheet material does not degrade, but instead is maintained over time." The Applicant states that pressure sensitive adhesive of Fagan is intended to provide a permanent bond to the wall. The Examiner has referred to Applicant's suggested columns in Fagan for such a disclosure and could not find the passage to support Applicant's arguments. Therefore, Applicant has failed to demonstrate how the presence of pressure sensitive adhesive would affect the basic and novel characteristics. In response to Applicant's argument that Narukawa does not appear to contain fabrics, the Examiner respectfully argues the contrary. Although, the building sheets may be fiber-reinforced sheets primarily composed of calcium sulfate dihydrate, Narukawa does disclose that the building sheet may also include a glass paper, glass mat or glass cloth (column 4, lines 40 - 45), which can be equated to Applicant's "glass fiber fabric". The Applicant requires that a fabric is present and that does not preclude that the fabric is used as a reinforcement .

*Jeff Boyle*  
November 22, 2009



TERREL MORRIS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700